## REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are numbered 1-20. The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated November 18, 2003 and the Advisory Action dated February 9, 2004 have been carefully considered by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider and allow the remaining claims.

## 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The present Office Action rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalra et al. (6,490,627). Applicants have reviewed the Kalra et al. reference and respectfully assert that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not obvious in view of Kalra et al. for the following rationale.

Regarding Independent Claims 1 and 20 embodiments of the presently claimed invention disclose a method and apparatus for implementing a method for adapting content to a handheld device from its proxy server. Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent Claims 1 and 20 include limitations, in part, as follows:

> [A] method of adapting content for
> transmission to a palmtop computer, comprising:
> receiving an identifier from the palmtop
> computer . . .

> accessing a table of data in conjunction with
> said identifier from the palmtop computer to select
> a profile for downloading information to the
> palmtop computer; and
> adapting content to be transmitted to the
> palmtop computer based upon the profile from said
> table of data. (Emphasis Added)

That is, the profile of the content transmitted to the palmtop computer is selected from a table of data by the process receiving the identifier from the palmtop computer, as described in embodiments of independent Claims 1 and 20 of the present invention. For example, in one embodiment, as shown in Tables 1 through 3, Figure 7, and described starting on page 11 line 17, the palmtop computer's abilities are looked up in a database by the identifier (or header information) of the instant application so that the palmtop computer's characteristics can be determined (e.g., by serial number, model number, device type, etc.). Therefore, as clearly stated in Claims 1 and 20 the table of data is used in conjunction with the identifier from the palmtop computer to determine the profile for downloading information.

Applicants respectfully submit that this claimed method for adapting content for transmission is fundamentally different from that of Kalra et al. reference. Specifically, in column 15 lines 57-67, column 16 lines 1-40, and column 17 lines 30-60, Applicants understand Kalra et al. to teach that the computing device is tested to establish a CPU constraint. That is, Kalra et al. teaches having the client CPU process

test samples of a plurality of adaptive streams to establish the CPU constraint. Also, Kalra et al. teaches that the CPU constraint can be determined by testing the capabilities of the client computer for media playback, audio sample, etc. Further, Kalra et al. provides a formula for establishing the CPU constraint on column 17 starting at line 33. Therefore, the Applicants understand Kalra et al. to teach that the computer accessing the server must have the CPU tested to establish a constraint for the flow of data.

Applicants respectfully submit that a method of having a CPU tested to determine the profile for receiving data in Kalra et al. is fundamentally different from claimed embodiments of the present invention. Specifically, Claims 1 and 20 of the present invention utilize a table of data based on an identifier from the palmtop computer to determine the profile for downloading information to the palmtop computer. That is, no testing of the palmtop CPU is suggested or necessary. As a result, a substantial time and bandwidth savings are recognized by the removal of a testing process for the palmtop CPU for embodiments of the present invention as described in independent Claims 1 and 20.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kalra et al. reference does not show nor suggest embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent

Claim 1 overcomes the cited references, and as such Claims 2-15 which depend on independent Claim 1 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 20, as amended, overcomes the cited reference.


Independent Claim 15

Regarding independent Claim 15 embodiments of the presently claimed invention disclose a method for adapting content to a handheld device from its proxy server. Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent Claim 15 includes limitations, in part, as follows:

[A] method of adapting content for transmission to a palmtop computer, comprising:
receiving an identifier from the palmtop computer, the identifier comprising a serial number and a request header transmitted from the palmtop computer;
accessing a table of data in conjunction with said identifier, said table of data comprising:
a processing power for a processor residing within the palmtop computer by reference to the identifier;
a display resolution parameter and a display color handling ability for a display of the palmtop computer by reference to the identifier;
a display parameter for a display of the palmtop computer by reference to the identifier;
an amount of memory available to the palmtop computer by reference to the identifier;
a data transmission format; and

a transmission speed for transmission to
the palmtop computer;
selecting a profile for downloading
information to the palmtop computer <u>from said table
of data in conjunction with said identifier</u>; and
adapting content to be transmitted to the
palmtop computer based upon the profile <u>from said
table of data</u>.  (Emphasis Added)

That is, the profile of the content transmitted to the
palmtop computer is selected from a table of data by the
process receiving the identifier from the palmtop computer,
as described in embodiments of independent Claim 15 of the
present invention.  For example, in one embodiment, as shown
in Tables 1 through 3, Figure 7, and described starting on
page 11 line 17, the palmtop computer's abilities are looked
up in a database by the identifier (or header information) of
the instant specification so that the palmtop computer's
characteristics can be determined (e.g., by serial number,
model number, device type, etc.).  Therefore, as stated in
Claim 15 the table of data is used in conjunction with the
identifier from the palmtop computer to determine the profile
for downloading information.

On the other hand, as described previously in analogous
arguments for independent Claims 1 and 20, Kalra et al.
teaches that the computing device is tested to establish a
CPU constraint.  In one embodiment, Kalra et al. teaches
having the client CPU process test samples of a plurality of
adaptive streams to establish the CPU constraint.  That is,

the CPU constraint can be determined by testing the capabilities of the client computer for media playback, audio sample, etc.

Therefore, the Applicants understand Kalra et al. to teach that the computer accessing the server must have the CPU tested to establish a constraint for the flow of data. Applicants respectfully submit that testing a CPU to determine the profile for receiving data as described in Kalra et al. is fundamentally different from the embodiment described in independent Claim 15. Specifically, Claim 15 of the present invention utilizes a table of data based on an identifier from the palmtop computer to determine the profile for downloading information to the palmtop computer. That is, no testing of the palmtop CPU is suggested or necessary. Thus, as an advantage of the present invention as claimed in independent Claim 15, a substantial time and bandwidth savings are recognized by the removal of a testing process for the palmtop CPU.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kalra et al. reference does not show nor suggest embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 15 overcomes the cited references, and as such Claims 16 - 19 which depend on independent Claim 15 are also in a

condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the facts and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: _18 March 2004_

Lin C. Hsu
Reg. No.: 46,315
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113